

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DARRELL IVAN BOLDEN, JR,

a/k/a “Yusuf A. El,”

BOP #05048-025,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

NO. 99-CR-30237 -WDS

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

STIEHL, District Judge:

Before the Court is defendant’s pro se motion entitled “Bill of Attainder” (Doc. 77). The Court has previously denied defendant’s motions to dismiss (See, Orders at Doc. 73 & 76) which challenged this Court’s jurisdiction. The defendant Darrell I. Bolden, who now identifies himself as Yusuf A. El, continues to assert that this Court is without jurisdiction to hear the pending matter, the supervised release revocation. In his latest motion, defendant seeks a copy of the Oath of Office administered to the below Judicial officer.

A law is considered a bill of attainder if it “legislatively determines guilt and inflicts punishment upon an identifiable individual without provision of the protections of a judicial trial.” *Nixon v. Adm. of Gen. Serv.*, 433 U.S. 425, 468 (1977). In this case, the supervised revocation procedure applies to a defendant who has previously been convicted of a crime and does not amount to a determination of guilt or innocence on the charged crime. See eg., *United States v. Hook*, 471 F.3d 766, 775 (2006).

Upon review of the record the Court **FINDS** that the defendant’s motion is wholly without

merit and **DENIES** defendant's motion on all grounds raised. Defendant should refrain from filing any additional frivolous motions. This Court has jurisdiction to review and determine the petition for revocation of supervised release once the defendant is returned to this district.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: 12 June, 2013

/s/ WILLIAM D. STIEHL
DISTRICT JUDGE